American Oriental Society

The Basis of Ancient Indian History (I)
Author(s): D. D. Kosambi
Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (Jan. - Mar., 1955), pp. 35-45
Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/595035
Accessed: 18-10-2015 10:51 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

information that are apt to furnish us with further help in elucidating problems of techniques or form have been deliberately left out of consideration. Such potential sources are works of Tocharian pictorial art with their numerous representations of jātaka scenes which are very likely to give us some insight into dramatic techniques, and the dramatic works of neighboring areas, the comparison of which with the dramatic works of neighboring areas, the comparison of which with Tocharian drama will add to our knowledge about Tocharian drama itself; aside from the study of Indic drama, the comparison with Tibetan drama in particular (which apparently shows striking affinities to the type of performance described here) should prove rewarding.

THE BASIS OF ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY (I).

D. D. KOSAMBI
TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH

I. 1. Introduction. **2.** Old tribes and new. **3.** Other tribes. **4.** Forest tribes. **5.** Caste as class.

II. 6. Rise and decline of trade. **7.** Land grants. **8.** Fields and inhabitants. **9.** Recapitulation.

1. INTRODUCTION. The advance of agrarian village economy over tribal country is the first great social revolution in India: the change from an aggregate of gentes to a society. This is still reflected in the endless ramifications of the extant caste system, where the caste names, endogamy, commensal tabu, exogamous septs observed in practice (often with totemic names), and caste *sabhā* councils are all of tribal origin. Though the individual village appeared changeless, virtually self-sufficient, and of a fixed pattern with almost closed production, the increasing density of village settlement inevitably brought about successive transformations of the superstructure. We know that in spite of caste division of labor within the village, its production was not of commodities except as regards a small part of the surplus reaching the hands of the state. The methods for extracting this surplus would necessarily differ in the same district according as to whether it had two villages or two thousand. These changes in the state mechanism, and in the class of people who received the surplus, must be regarded as material for history, even when no episodes and chronological details or king-names are known.

What becomes then of the lack of historical sense which stamps all Indian source-materials and intellectuals, of all but the most recent period? The later, unchanging, virtually closed village economy is clearly responsible. Once settled down to its ultimate form, external happenings had very little meaning for the unarmed village. Consciousness of other people means contact with them which in turn implies war or trade and exchange of commodities. Compared to the round of seasons with their marked differences of climate, occupation, and food supply, the difference between years was negligible because the production and labor were not cumulative. The year's produce was distributed and consumed during the course of the year, mostly within the village. Any outstanding personality either migrated to the capital, or if he left a mark upon the place of his birth, was swallowed up by folklore, myth, deification of the hero or saint to whom a cult might be dedicated but whose personal history would evaporate in legend. The rustic intellectual—the village brahmin whose mentality stamps most Sanskrit literature directly or indirectly—concentrated upon the almanac, not the succession of years. Records were useless and difficult to keep on the available materials; the all-pervading ritual had been reduced to formulae and verses memorized by the elect. Only to a court-recorder like Kalhaṇa or to traders (mostly Jain) did annals or registers mean anything. IF THE VILLAGE SEEMS TO EXIST FROM "TIME IMMEMORIAL," IT IS ONLY BECAUSE THE MEMORY OF TIME SERVED NO USEFUL FUNCTION IN THE VILLAGE ECONOMY THAT DOMINATED THE COUNTRY. Brahminism, like other sacerdotal groups in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, proceeded by claiming scriptural or divine sanction "from the remotest antiquity" for whatever innovation was thrust upon the priestly class. Changes of government and the general spread of village cultivation would have worn down

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

to approximately the same elementary pattern a village founded in 1350 A.D. as one of 250 B.C. This may be seen by comparison today with its neighboring villages of Sopārā (Śūrpāraka); or of the hamlet of Doṃgrī (on Salsette island, opposite Bassein) which should be the *Dounga* of Ptolemy, and probably the ancient Dhenukākaṭa.[1]

A change of the utmost historical importance is in the relation of the ideological superstructure to the productive basis; what had been an indispensable stimulus at the beginning became a complete hindrance by absolute stagnation at the end. Marx noted only the backwardness engendered by the caste system, the grip of the most disgusting ritual such as worship of the cow, cobra, monkey, which sickeningly degraded man. On the other hand, without these superstitions assimilated by brahminism at need (*e.g. Rāj.* 1. 182-6 for the Nāga cults of Kaśmīr; Stein's note on the *Nīlamata-purāṇa*), tribal society could not have been converted peacefully to new forms nor free savages changed into helpless serfs—though peace between tribes (whose normal intercourse means war) and change from hunting or pastoralism to agriculture guarantee a decidedly more secure livelihood for the tribesman. Only an imposing ritual, or overpowering force, or modern socialism could have won the savage over. The Indian method reduced the need for violence to a minimum by substitution of religion; caste and the *smṛtis* adopted or replaced totem and tabu with more power than the sword or bow. This avoided large-scale chattel slavery, never important in Indian relations of production as it was in Greece and Rome. Brahmin ritual, moreover, was not just witch-doctor's mumbo-jumbo, but accompanied a practical calendar, fair meteorology, and sound-working knowledge of agricultural technique unknown to primitive tribal groups which never went beyond the digging-stick or hoe. For all his magic cantrips, the brahmin immigrant[2] into tribal lands was at first an effective pioneer and educator, though inevitably becoming a mere drain upon production. The same emphasis upon traditional superstition eventually became a fetter, completely inhibiting any further advance in the means of production, leading to stagnation with helplessness in the fact of invasion, famine, epidemic, or other disaster. We must note the difference between this later brahminism and the far earlier type which had developed within the tribe. Alexander's invasion of the Punjab had been resisted desperately by Aryan tribesmen with incitement and full support of the tribal brahmins, though without cooperation between any two tribes. The later brahmin had neither tribal nor bourgeois patriotism, looked out only for himself, remaining apart from the rest of the people, and preached the necessity of strong kingship, no matter whose, even when it meant surrender to an invader (Mbh. 12. 67. 6-7, etc.).

It was impossible for the villages to develop a bourgeoisie; science, transport, technical progress, heavy industry, were impossible too without a basic change which would lead to absolute dominance of commodity production. This came with the British period. The victory of the machine brought with it the missing historical sense; the new universal market created, for the first time, an Indian bourgeoisie and nationalism, as well as bourgeois nationalisms for the people of each cultural-linguistic component.

The nature of the *Arthaśāstra* economy and difference between Mauryan and pre-Mauryan society having been considered in an earlier paper (*JBBRAS*, XXVII (1951), pp. 180-213), I shall concentrate, in what follows, mostly upon the principal changes visible in the Gupta period. Neither empire was founded by foreign invaders; neither is a simple change of dynasty over a changeless basis, as would be clear even if we had nothing more to go upon than the splendid literary developments which include Kālidāsa. Conglomerated villages do not suddenly produce great court poetry and drama without reason. For the rest, it must be confessed that the official and

[1] E. H. Johnston, *JRAS*, 1941, pp. 208-213. The older identification of Dhenukākaṭa with Dharṇīkoṭā in the Guntur district (near Amarāvatī) seems based upon a Dhānyakaṭaka in the Mayidavolu copper plates of the Pallava Yuvarāja Śivaskandavarman (*EI.* VI, pp. 84-89). So many Dharṇīkoṭā donors coming to Kārle, Nāsik, Kaṇherī right across the peninsula would be unaccountable. Dhenukākaṭa must have been on or near the west coast, convenient to the trade routes to all these places.

[2] *DHI*, p. 182: "Cette conquête se continue a l'époque historique, notamment comme au Bengale, par l'installation de colonies brahmaniques dotées par les souverains." Many brahmins immigrated without royal invitation. The "conquest" is not merely spiritual, but economic and sociological as well. It is, in fact, the real Aryan conquest, if the term has any meaning at all.

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

fashionable histories[3] now available, with their emphasis upon names, conjectured dates, changes of dynasty, but complete neglect of what happened to the means and relations of production, would (if the reader takes them seriously) go far to prove the oversimplified proto-Marxian views.

2. OLD TRIBES AND NEW. Excavations at places like Brahmagiri in Mysore State show chalcolithic remains topped immediately by a Mauryan stratum, followed without intermediacy by a Sātavāhana layer. In the vast slaughter of Asoka's Kaliṅga war, there is no mention of opposing princes or kings. Elsewhere in the Asokan edicts only tribal names appear. But he mentions by name the contemporary Greek kings Antiochus, Antigonus, Ptolemaios, Magas, Aleksandros; so it is clear that, except for the Mauryan empire, there was no kingship of the type in India at that time. Pre-Mauryan and Mauryan trade plus the Mauryan conquest gave the necessary impetus to change from tribal chieftainship to absolute monarchy based upon a standing army and regular taxes. Contrast this with the list of Samudragupta's conquests (Allahabad pillar, *F.* 1) where kings far outnumber kingless tribes; for example, nine among many kings of Āryāvarta totally exterminated, another twelve among the many of the peninsula (*dakṣiṇāpatha*) conquered but set up again as feudatories. Kingship which would ultimately lead to feudalism from above was becoming a common local phenomenon by the middle of the 4th century A. D., albeit with certain large territorial gaps. Unlike the Mauryans, the Guptas had no known tribal

[3] Beginning with Vincent Smith's *Oxford History of India* (with its praise for "strong" empires of all sorts) and finishing as of 1954 with the Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan's *Age of Imperial Unity* and *The Classical Age*. These books start with an incredibly slender foundation of valid data, on which an imposing superstructure of conjecture, mere verbiage, and class-fashions is erected; of course, the class is no longer the British but the Indian bourgeoisie, which strives desperately to produce a history as "respectable" as that of the foreigner in his own country.

The general reference works are *Ms.* = *Manusmṛti*; *F* = inscriptions by number in J. F. Fleet, *Inscriptions of the early Gupta kings and their successors* (Corpus Insc. Ind. III; Calcutta, 1888); *P* = F. E. Pargiter's *Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* (Oxford, 1913); *EI* = *Epigraphia Indica; IA* = *Indian Antiquary*; *JRAS* = *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*; *IHQ* = *Indian Historical Quarterly*. Besides these, I have made use of the Nirṇaysāgar edition of the *Harṣacaritam* and the English translation by E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas (Or. Trans. Fund New Ser. VIII, Royal As. Soc. London, 1929); W. Norman Brown, *The Story of Kālaka* (Washington, 1933) and the article *Ārya Kālaka* by Muni Kalyāṇavijaya, *Dvivedi Abhinandana Grantha* (Allahabad, *Sam.* 1990) pp. 94-119; *Rāj.* = Stein's translation of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*; L. de la Vallée-Poussin: *DHI* = *Dynasties et l'Histoire de l'Inde* (Paris, 1935) and *ITM* = *l'Inde aux temps des Mauryas* (Paris, 1930) for an excellent précis of the facts without verbose conjectures. For the Chinese travellers, S. Beal's *Buddhist Records of the Western World* (2 vol.; London, 1884); J. Legge: *Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms* (Oxford, 1886); H. A. Giles: *idem* (Cambridge, 1923). K. P. Jayaswal's *Hindu Polity* (2nd ed. Bangalore, 1943) gives many conjectures which seem ill grounded, and A. S. Altekar's *History of Village Communities in Western India* (Bom. Uni./Oxford, 1927) contains little history except in the title; both of these have been left out of the discussion. The edition of Marx and Engels' scattered writings on India is undated, being no. 4 of the Socialist Book Club's series printed at Allahabad, between 1934 and 1938. Neither the editor (Mulk Raj Anand), nor those who read through the booklet before publication (Edgell Rickward, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sajjad Zaheer, P. C. Joshi, Z. A. Ahmad), nor foundation members of the Book Club like M. R. Masani, Jayaprakash Narayan, R. M. Lohia, Narendra Deva saw fit to warn the reader that these selections would be completely misleading without proper study and grasp of later work on primitive societies by the same authors. R. C. Majumdar's *Corporate Life In Ancient India* (Calcutta, 1918) and Radhakumud Mookerji's *Local Government In Ancient India* (Oxford, 1920) possess the merit of coming down to reality with epigraphic records, in place of the usual *veda-purāṇa* speculations; but these scholars lost sight of all historical movement, thrusting everything upon "Ancient India" indiscriminately, without regard to tribal life and developments stemming from it, or to the element of decay that is quite palpable when closed, self-sufficient village economy becomes the simple norm. Besides the decennial Indian *Census* reports, useful summaries are to be found in E. Thurston & K. Rangachari: *Castes & Tribes Of Southern India* (7 vol., Madras, 1909); H. H. Risley: *Tribes & Castes of Bengal—Ethnographic Glossary* (2 vol.; Calcutta, 1891) shows a touching faith in the lower nasal index for Aryans as against the Comtism of J. C. Nesfield's: *Brief View of the Caste System of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh* (Allahabad, 1888); neither book is to be trusted in its theories; R. E. Enthoven: *Tribes & Castes of Bombay* (Bombay, 1920; 2 vol.) was the last book of the series, as that of D. C. J. Ibbetson: *Report on the Census of the Punjab*, vol. I (Calcutta, 1883) seems to have been the first. The studies of S. C. Roy and Verrier Elwin on the tribes of Choṭā Nāgpūr, and the cautious work of J. H. Hutton: *Caste in India* (Oxford-Bombay, 1951) show the connection between tribal and caste observances with less theorizing than the pioneers. A. M. Hocart's *Caste* (London, 1950) is pure theory undiluted with reality. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri's *Studies in Coḷa History and Administration* gives a picture of the southern *sabhā*.

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

origin. This seems to be the chief reason for special prominence given to the marriage of Candragupta I to the Licchavi princess Kumāradevī, a patent of nobility for the Guptas, who came to power too early to find a Mahābhārata ancestor. Much is conjectured as to the Licchavis being a great power in the north, but the epigraphs show only a late and trifling royal house in Nepal, claiming origin from the ancient tribe whose power had been completely broken by Ajātaśatru in their original home Bihār (capital Basārh, ancient Vesālī) by 470 B. C. The brahmins even took the Licchavis as a low mixed caste (*Ms.* 10. 22). The Manusmṛti takes the Ambaṣṭha (*Ms.* 10. 8) to be the offspring of a brahmin father and vaiśya mother, the Ugra (*Ms.* 10. 9) to originate from a kṣatriya father and śūdra mother. But the latter was a tribe (cf. R. Fick, *Festschrift Winternitz* [Leipzig, 1933] pp. 279-286), and the former is given as the medical guild (*Ms.* 10. 47) as well as a tribe (Mbh. 2. 29. 6). It is clear that militarized tribes headed towards oligarchy (over a conquered population), monarchy, or with growing trade to nationhood; those without weapons could survive only as guilds or castes. Both local and invading tribes (like the later Rajputs) were thus being absorbed into society, at different levels, some giving their name to an entire province.

One important group of tribes nearing extinction was the Nāgas. Nāga kings (*P.* 49, 72) are mentioned twice in purāṇic lists, the second time without names (*P.* 53, 73); the Nāga mark remains indelibly stamped upon proper names. Samudragupta destroyed kings Nāgadatta, Gaṇapatināga, Nāgasena in Āryāvarta proper. Candragupta II (Vikramāditya) married a Nāga princess Kuberanāgā. Circa 400 A. D., we find a *mahārāja* Maheśvaranāga, son of king Nāgabhaṭṭa (*F.* 77). King Saṃkṣobha, son of Hastin, gives away (*F.* 25; about A. D. 538) a village in the Maṇināga-peṭha.[4] The neighbour king Śarvanātha (*F.* 28; A. D. 512-3) donated shares in a village to a merchant Śaktināga, son of Svāmināga; another share to Kumāranāga and Skandanāga jointly. The *Navasāhasāṅkacaritam* mentions cobra (*nāga*) guardian deities of important central Indian cities like Dhārā. We see how the assimilation proceeded, the tribal origin of the Central Indian city of Nagpur, the reason why the cobra accompanies great Hindu gods like Śiva, Viṣṇu, Gaṇeśa; why the *nāgapañcamī* is so important a festival. The point is that the Nāgas are not alone. To this day, some Nāga tribes survive in Assam, Burma, and beyond the frontier; but so do many other tribes in Assam, Bengal, Bihār, Choṭā Nāgpūr, the Western Ghāṭs, the Nīlgiris—i. e. wherever regular farming and settlement by the village system did not pay. The major historical change in ancient India was not between dynasties but in the advance of agrarian village settlements over tribal lands, metamorphosing tribesmen into peasant cultivators, or guild craftsmen.

3. OTHER TRIBES remain in various stages, often dwindling to royal families, as in the case of the Licchavis, and perhaps the Nāgas in Āryāvarta. Of the nine tribes that paid tribute to Samudragupta, apparently on the same level as frontier kings, the Mālavas (*P.* 54, 74) enjoyed sufficient respect to have their tribal era used as often as the Gupta era; this without mention of any Mālava king[5] as a ruler, hence presumably through Mālava tribal patronage of brahmins.[6] The widely dis-

[4] For the survival of the Maṇināga cult, D. C. Sircar, *EI*, XXVIII, pp. 328-334, particularly in Orissa; Lokavigraha-bhaṭṭāraka ruled (600 A. D.) *Tosalyāṃ sāṣṭādaśāṭavīrājyāyām*. As for the prevalence of the Nāga cult, it is not necessary to postulate a 'wide-spread pre-Aryan Nāga civilisation.' It would suffice if unassimilated Nāgas were steadily driven beyond an expanding periphery of 'Aryanisation,' there to act upon even more savage tribal people. Note that later, descent from a Nāga-kula is regarded as a good substitute for genealogies going back to the epics.

[5] A. S. Altekar, reading the Nāndsā sacrificial *yūpa* pillars in *EI*, XXVII, pp. 252-268 presents us with an illogical *king* Śrīsoma of the "Mālava republic," though the word for king is nowhere to be found in the text he gives on p. 264, facing his English version. Possibly, the royal office and title has been conjectured from the *rājarṣi-dharma-paddhati* of p. 263; a *mahāsenāpati* is to be found on the third of these pillars (p. 267).

[6] In older days, they could even have left a Mālava *gotra* among brahmins, as did the Bhṛgu, Vaikarṇa, Purukutsa, and other tribes (*JBBRAS*, XXVI, 1950, pp. 21-80). The Udumbaras are known as a tribe by their coins and other, literary records; the name survives as a Viśvāmitra *gotra*, though it was also the Kaśyapa poet Bhavabhūti's family name. This tribe (Kāśikā on Pāṇ. 4. 1. 173 tribe; 4. 1. 99, gotra) has been left out of the main discussion, in spite of an excellent totemic name, as it would take too long to discuss J. Przyluski's Austro-Asiatic theory (*JA*, 208, 1926, pp. 1-59). The Śālaṅkāyana dynasty of the Gupta period may bear a tribal name; the tribe existed (Kāśikā on Pāṇ. 5. 3. 114) and has also left brahmin gotras in the Bhṛgus, Viśvāmitras, and Agastis, the wide divergence being sugges-

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

tributed Ābhīras show all stages of tribal development; ten unnamed Ābhīra kings, and people, unknown in Pāli books, are mentioned in the purāṇas and 2nd century A.D. inscriptions (*P.* 45, 54, 72, 74; *EI*, VIII, p. 89, Īśvarasena; *DHI*, pp. 185-188). The tribe paid tribute to Samudragupta, and the widespread modern Ahīr caste is generally taken to be its offshoot. The Kharaparikas apparently survived in Damoh district till after the Muslim conquest (*EI*, XII, pp. 46-7). The Ārjunāyanas of the inscription are to be identified with those in the Gaṇapātha on Pāṇ. 4.2:53. The Sanakānika tribe in the tributary list, had developed a royal feudatory house (*F.* 3) with the hereditary title *mahārāja*, by A.D. 401-2. The Varika king Viṣṇunandin (*F.* 59) set up a sacrificial post in Mālava *saṃvat* 428 = A.D. 372-3 on which three royal ancestors in the direct line are given. Five tribal-oligarchic nations in some sort of diplomatic relations with Samudragupta were powerful enough to be ranked apart, presumably as invading rulers; the Daivaputras, Śāhīs, Śāhānuśāhīs, Śakas (*P.* 45, 46, 72), Muruṇḍas (*P.* 46, 47, 72). The Śakas had later to be defeated in battle by Candragupta II. The Śāhīs and Śāhānuśāhīs were presumably Scythian invaders assuming the title from Sassanian kings, and might have been the lot invited by the Jain *ācārya* Kālaka; other such tribal invaders were the Hūṇas (*P.* 45-47, 72) who fought against many Indian kings and were eventually absorbed without trace though more slowly than the Puṣyamitras defeated by Skandagupta. The Muruṇḍas ranked high in the scale of importance and respectability, for king Śarvanātha's mother (*F.* 28, 29, 31; *circa* A.D. 516-534) is queen Muruṇḍasvāminī[7] or Muruṇḍadevī i.e. the Muruṇḍa princess, no other personal name being given. The Yaudheyas (Pāṇ. 4.1.176, 5.3.117), supposedly exterminated by Rudradāman (*EI*, VIII, p. 44) had formerly no royal names on their coins; in the Gupta period they elected, or at least assented to, (*puraskṛta*) a king-commander *mahārāja mahāsenāpati* who could set up his own inscription (*F.* 59). If the Yaudheyas are to be taken as the modern Johiyas (*DHI*, p. 44) of Bahawalpur on the Sutlej, the tribe-caste survived the institution of kingship.

The Vākāṭaka name is known only through a royal line (*F.* 53-56 *et al*; *P.* 50, 73 Vindhyaśakti) but they seem originally to have been a tribe also. The Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II married Prabhavatīguptā, daughter of Devagupta (= Candragupta II) and Kuberanāgā, which is taken as showing the immediacy of these kings to the Gupta empire; that such alliances at the time freed the lesser king from the last remnants of tribal restrictions has usually been ignored. Under tribal law, marriage with a stranger would not be legitimate without special adoption into the tribe; a tribal chief had only the rank of first among peers, whether his father had been king before him or not, the real power vesting in tribal assemblies till such a period as inequalities between individual tribesmen's wealth become too great for tribal institutions. The Maukharis (*F.* 47-51) were originally tribal kings whose rule became paramount in northern India after the Guptas. Their tribal origin and the remnants of tribal right are proved by the fact that Harṣa Śīlāditya, even when he had the most powerful army of his day and was in fact the ruler, had to undergo the formality of election to his deceased Maukhari brother-in-law's throne. Actually, he assumed power jointly with his widowed sister Rājyaśrī, at least in the beginning of rule over Maukhari domains; which is not to be interpreted as evidence of republicanism in ancient Indian monarchies (*pace* Jayaswal) but assent to the rule of a stranger by the leading Maukharis, who counted as nobles of the former court. Harṣa succeeded to his brother's kingdom without question or election. Clearly, almost every tribe of any power or importance had developed kingship by the Gupta age. The kings did not

tive of such tribal contact; but the connection between tribe and dynasty should be traced directly, for brahminism was by now strong enough to lend a *gotra* name to the ruling chiefs of a tribe. On the other hand, even recently, hereditary brahmin family priests took on the surnames of the non-brahmin feudal barons whom they served, e.g. Ghorpaḍe, Āṃgre, Ghāṭage, of Mahārāṣṭra. The 1921 *Census* listed a total of 515 Udumbara brahmins in the Panch Mahals and Kaira districts of Bombay. The Ābhīras have left no *gotra* among brahmins, but a sept or subdivision named Ahīr appears among the tailor, shepherds, milkmen, potters, carpenters, goldsmiths, leader-workers and fishermen castes, as also among the present Kātkari and Bhīl tribes (Enthoven 1.34, 1.157, 2.173, 3.25) as among the true Marāṭhā settlers. With the Bhīls, this may be ascribed to the *ahīr* fish totem; but for the rest, the most plausible explanation would be contact with the classical *ābhīra* tribe.

[7] This compound enables us to dismiss S. Konow's interpretation of Muruṇḍa as Scythian word translated by *svāmin* (*DHI*, pp. 45-6).

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

always outgrow tribal restrictions, or develop an outlook broader than that for which society beyond tribal limits hardly exists. The pride, prejudices, heroic inconsequence, and absolute political incapacity (*DHI*, p. 132) of every little Rajput clan at a critical period of Mohammedan aggression are clear symptoms of inability to see beyond the tribe. This restricted vision explains *jāti* endogamy, exclusiveness, and why so many of the surviving non-military tribes, when in close contact with developed Indian society, became "criminal tribes"; stealing from anyone not a member of the gens is no crime in tribal law, often a simple duty.

4. FOREST TRIBES also continued to exist in spite of the aforementioned adaptation and change. Gupta records pass the Bhīl or Bhilla tribesmen by in silence, but the purāṇas mention seven Gardabhila kings (*P.* 45, 46, 72) though the accepted variant is Gardabhina (e.g. Bhinmāl = Bhilmāl). The other seems preferable from the story of Kālaka where the king who abducted the *ācārya's* sister, the nun Sarasvatī, for his harem and lost his life in the following invasion, is named Gardabhilla; I attach special importance to the termination. This is related to the legend of Vikrama (son of a Gandharva transformed for a while into a donkey *gardabha*) who later drove out the invaders. The more primitive Bhīls survived as tribesmen, because of their superior prowess as archers, but aversion to the plough. Their labour, way of life, and beliefs now approximate more and more to those of the ordinary Kuṇabī agriculturist.

The explicit mention of unnamed forest tribes is found in Samudragupta's *praśasti*, where the emperor is credited with having reduced all the forest kings to servitude: *paricārikī-kṛta-sarvāṭavika-rājasya*. The territory of these "kings" lies predominantly in what is now Bengal, Orissa, Central India; there was no question of the densely settled portion of the Gangetic plain relapsing into tribal forms of production. But we know that besides the territory between the Narmadā and the Jamunā, all the eastern frontier and the whole peninsula had their full quota of tribes too.

The process of absorption was varied, apart from direct conquest. The passage of tribes into guilds or castes may be seen from our *Census* reports. I am concerned here only with early historical evidence for assimilation. In general traders and Buddhist missionaries penetrated tribal areas long before their formal, thinly held conquest by the Mauryans. The brahmin Bāvarī (Malālasekera, *Dict. Pāli Proper Names*, II, 279-80) had founded a *gurukula* on the Godāvarī river even before his conversion by the Buddha. This intercourse led first to accumulation of wealth by trade for some tribes, knowledge of better weapons and improved military tactics; later to farming and civilisation. Thus in the trade period we find support to wandering almsmen in the form of cave retreats or monastic foundations which craftsman, merchant, and king endowed so generously. The connection of Jainism with trade and dissemination of Buddhism along trade routes are well documented. In the settlement period which we shall mainly consider, the emphasis passed to the brahmin, with royal village endowments to brahmins or temples managed by brahmins.

King Hastin (*F.* 25) is called ruler over Ḍabhāla and the 18 forest kingdoms, reminiscent of the modern Aṭhārāgarh about Sambalpur. He gave donations to brahmins like any other contemporary. His case is peculiar in that he claims descent in the *nṛpati-parivrājaka* 'royal ascetic' line. Though many kings are supposed traditionally to have taken to the ascetic life in old age, that would not suffice to give the label to Hastin's family. The correct interpretation seems to be that some ascetic going into the wilderness acquired special respect from the tribesmen, married into the tribe, aggrandized its power as king, and so founded the dynasty. Something of the sort is recorded of the very rich, powerful, cultured Indian kingdom of Cambodia; the founder was Kauṇḍinya, an Indian adventurer of high caste and considerable skill with the bow who married the aboriginal (*nāga*) princess Somā that ruled the local tribe, thus starting the kingdom which has left such magnificent architectural remains. That brahmins took consorts from the aborigines or śūdras is known; the poet Bāṇa had two *pāraśava* half-brothers, so begotten. Lokanātha in Bengal, proud to claim such descent from brahmins through śūdra women, (*EI*, XV, p. 301 ff.) was independent enough to defeat armies sent against him, and to make land-grants to brahmins on his own account. IT IS ONLY WITH FIXED REGULAR VILLAGE SETTLEMENTS THAT THE FULL RIGIDITY OF CASTE DEVELOPS. Dharmadoṣa is supposed to have kept his kingdom free from all caste intermixture *vihita-sakala-varṇasaṃkaram* (*F.* 35) as in the golden *kṛta* age,

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

but is himself suspected of mixed brahmin-kṣatriya ancestry. The prize example of brahminism adjusting itself to reality and coming to terms with local customs is in Malabar, where the patriarchal Nambūdiri brahmins regularly beget children for the "śūdra" matrilinear Nair caste whose chiefs count as kṣatriyas, and which retained all political power. An example in the opposite direction is of king Mahāśiva-Tīvararāja (*F.* 81) who describes himself as a *parama-vaiṣṇava* of the Pāṇḍu line and grants land to brahmins after worshipping them; but the family was of Śabara lineage[8] (*Arch. Sur. Ind. Rep.*, XVII, p. 25 ff.), a forest tribe without a doubt. The Ikṣvākus of southern Kosala (Bilaspur and southern neighbouring districts) would similarly claim descent from Rāma, shedding their undoubtedly low origin with the help of brahmins who were ever willing to rewrite their own puranic records for such purposes. A recognized method whereby a sufficiently wealthy king might acquire the formal superiority of higher caste over his fellows was the *hiraṇyagarbha* rebirth ceremony described in the purāṇas and mentioned in royal inscriptions (*IA*, XIX, p. 9 ff.; *EI*, XVII, p. 328; XXVII, pp. 8-9, etc.). The golden "womb" from which the "rebirth" took place went to the officiating brahmins as their fee.

King Mayūraśarman's personal history as recorded on the Tālaguṇḍa pillar (*EI*, VIII, pp. 24-36; cf. also *Arch. Survey Mysore,* Report 1929, pp. 50-60, for the doubtful Candravalli inscription) appears romantic but is undoubtedly veridical, not to be compared to the interesting myth of epigraphs by much later Kadambas who also claimed him for ancestor under the kṣatriya termination, Mayūravarman. The hero, who may be placed in the 4th or 5th century, has a totemic connection with the Kadamba tree (stanzas 7-8 of the inscription), which gave its name to the whole line as the horse did to the Sātavāhanas.[9] He went from his native forest with the preceptor Vīraśarman as a brahmin student, to enter a charitable foundation (? *ghaṭikā*) at the Pallava capital, Kāñcī. There he had a quarrel with some cavalry officer, took to arms, made himself lord of all the forest territory extending to the very gates of Śrīparvata, and levied tribute from minor chiefs including the Bāṇas. Successfully ambushing a Pallava expedition sent against him, he came to terms with the Pallavas as a semi-independent feudatory, to be invested with land stretching to the western ocean. His descendants intermarried with the Guptas, Gāṅgas, and Vākāṭakas. According to the *Sahyādri-khaṇḍa* of the *Skanda-purāṇa*, he was responsible for importing northern brahmin settlers to the coast about Goa. This was unmistakably the introduction of a new village system in wild

[8] The *śabara* lineage of the Pāṇḍuvaṃśīs, though admitted by *DHI*, p. 269, has been disputed—like almost any other detail of Indian history. The point is of little importance, when it is admitted that most such dynasties had an obscure, local, tribal origin. The Nalas seem much more likely to be Niṣādas turned into Naiṣadhas (*EI*, XXVIII, pp. 12-17, particularly p. 15) than actual descendants of the *Nalopākhyāna* hero, if he really existed. The Ikṣvākus of the original line died out with Sumitra of Mithilā, according to the Purāṇas which then go on to make Prasenajit (known to be of low Mātaṅga descent) and the Buddha (a tribal Śākyan) Ikṣvākus, so that the Mahānadī aborigines were following a handy method of rising in the social scale to match their new economic status. The Pālas, Bhaumas, and others of the sort had a local origin too. The Pāṇḍuvaṃśīs may be identical with the Pandos of the 1931 *Census*, vol. I, part. 3.

[9] I have shown that the proper Sanskrit equivalent is *saptivāhana*, as actually found in the *Kalki* (*Anu-bhāgavata*) *Purāṇa*. Saptikarṇa could then be a split totem. But the Gaṇapāṭha on Pān. 4.1.112 reports names *Tūṇakarṇa, Masūrakarṇa, Kharjūrakarṇa, Mayūrakarṇa*, which do not admit the direct interpretation of Kumbhakarṇa or Jatūkarṇa; thus *-karṇa* may have been a rare patronymic termination. J. Przyluski demonstrated in *JRAS*, 1929, pp. 273-279: *Hippokoura et Satakarni* that *sāta* means horse in the Austric-Muṇḍā languages, *kon*, son; the compound would then indicate 'son of the horse'—possibly the Asokan Sātiyaputa—while the horse does occur on some Sātavāhana coins. This is again a tribal totem, though he nowhere mentions the word totem. There is a still closer parallel between the two tribal dynasties when we note that the Sātakaṇis often claimed explicitly to be brahmins, as the *ekabamhaṇasa* of Gotamīputra in Nasik cave no. 3 (*EI*, VIII, p. 60). Such bivalent *brahmin-kṣatriyas* are common, particularly in the South, where we have the Māṭūra family of Karnatak, the Sena kings of Bengal (of Kanarese origin), and plenty of others. The Guhilots have the same double caste (*EI*, XII, p. 11; see also D. R. Bhandarkar in *JASB*, V, 1909, p. 167 ff.) the Candels, and many others. The Pallavas claim descent from the fighting brahmin Aśvatthāman (the Spatembas of Megasthenes), but modern ethnographers connect them with the present low Palli caste, or the Kurumbas. Similarly, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas have been associated with the extant Raḍḍi (Kāpu) caste. There are still many groups whose claim to brahminhood is allowed by some associates, but generally contested by other brahmins, though there would not be inter-marriage in any case, even if the claim should be universally admitted. The Kadamba tree is still worshipped as a totem by the Gāvaḍās and other Western Ghat tribe castes.

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

country, whose results may still be discerned in the remarkable profit-sharing communes of Goa.

The position of the brahmin (whether immigrant or risen from tribal priests) as tool for change of status is not to be doubted; he traced not only the theological but the real foundation of absolute monarchy by helping form the defenceless, agrarian, non-tribal village, first providing social contact beyond the tribe.

5. CASTE AS CLASS ON A COMPARATIVELY PRIMITIVE LEVEL OF PRODUCTION, after the agrarian settlement, is also easily proved. Transition from tribe or guild to caste means primarily enrollment of the group in a hierarchical scheme of general society, under brahmin sanction. Group endogamy, exogamous septs, tribal cults, and even the name generally survive, with brahminization of myths and observances. The relative occupational, social, and economic position of a *jāti*, with respect to the rest of the environment, coincide—allowing for historical changes—except for the brahmins, whose pretensions are higher (because of their key position) than their wealth. Our scriptures always prescribe lesser punishment for the offence of a man of higher caste towards a lower, than the reverse. The primitive king can rise above tribal restrictions only when he becomes independent of tribal property, which means only after the predominance of village economy. The process may be traced even in "Aryan" sources, right from the vedic age, though there the development of classes as well as agriculture took place within the tribe, and led to the four-caste theory after the first Ṛgvedic division into two *varṇas*, Ārya and śūdra. For the extraneous tribal recruits in the period we consider, we have only a few brahmins and a great many śūdras, both subdivided into innumerable local castes. It is of the utmost importance to recognize the difference between this later, generic, nominal śūdra and that of the *smṛtis*, which continue to use the word in a traditional sense. Modern usage, for example, would consider as śūdras virtually all the low "mixed castes" in the Manusmṛti, *e.g. kaivarta*. Yet the very fact that these tribal guilds or castes were there not called śūdras but labelled as a special mixture proves that the real, traditional śūdra was originally quite distinct from the later collective name for all working castes; we shall prove that he faded from the scene, with a few local exceptions. The complicated, inadequate, self-contradictory theory of new castes by intermixture of the old four was the early brahmin reaction to the adjunction of tribes and guilds; so also was allowing repeated hypergamy to change aborigine or śūdra even into a brahmin (*Ms.* 10. 84). Both these tolerant rules vanish after developed village settlement, in spite of the *śāstras*, as official practices.

Let us first note a few of the innumerable survivals that attest primitive tribal origin. For example, the name[10] Ḍombhigrāma (*F.* 38, A.D. 571) can only have derived from a settlement of Ḍoms or some such tribe-caste. Similarly, the ending *pallī* (cf. Vyāghrapallikā, Kācarapallikā, *F.* 31, A.D. 533) shows origin as a tribal settlement, which is the meaning of the word in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, and in many classical Sanskrit verses. In A.D. 490-91, Vyāghrasena's Surat plates (*EI*, XI, pp. 221-2) grant the village of Purohitapallikā to a brahmin priest; the name would indicate a tribal hamlet infiltrated by at least one *purohita* before the grant was made. Samudragupta defeated, and then restored as feudatory, a king Damana of Eraṇḍapalla in the south; the word *pālyā* or some variant still denotes village in most Dravidian languages but so do other words. *Pallī* in Bengali remains an equivalent for *grāma*, but 'hamlet' is also denoted by *palli-grāma* which should at first have indicated a village of autochthonous tribal origin rather than be taken as a translation-compound. The component can be picked out of modern village names all over the country, as probably *auli* in Hindi, certainly *valī* in Marathi: Kāndivalī, Ḍoṃbivalī, Borivalī on Bombay island, Maḷavalī, Loṇāvaḷā (originally Nānivalī) etc. In the latter cases, the aboriginal element is still to be found in the Kātakari tribe of the neighbouring hills, while the settled cultivator of the adjoining flatland is not racially very different, and certainly not an 'Aryan' conqueror. The essential difference between the two is the failure of the surviving aborigines to take to plough culture or to some craft needed by agrarian society.

The replacement of Asokan Pāli and Sātavāhana Prakrit by Sanskrit is also a class phenomenon, not due to some racial difference between "Dra-

[10] We can only mention in passing the Ḍombhī-Herūka of Tāranātha, the Dharma-yāna tantric developments in Buddhism, the Dharma cult in post-Islamic Bengal, and the Dharmarāja worship of the Tigaḷas about Bangalore. The cults spread, not at a high level but among the more primitive people.

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

vidian" and "Aryan." The classical idiom and the brahmin ritual that accompanied it mark a ruling class whose ultimate racial and tribal origin might be much the same as of the local śūdra cultivators over whom it now manifested superiority by caste and by knowledge of Sanskrit, though founded upon private property and monopoly of arms. Sanskrit helped create a class solidarity beyond the locality.

The thesis is as follows in broad outline: Where the original plough-farming communities were started by northern immigrants, attracted labor from the surrounding tribesmen, bred rapidly because of the increased food supply to throw out colonies, the region and its language are now Aryan. Where the local population sent forth people who returned with the new knowledge—often becoming brahmins in the process—the area remains Dravidian. Where the new way of food production was not adopted at all, we still have the aboriginal tribesmen. Differences shown between adjacent groups by anthropometric measurements need not be called "racial," as selection, diet, long inbreeding would account for them quite as well. The linguistic conclusion, that Austro-Asiatic Muṇḍā-speaking people were driven to the hills by Aryan or Dravidian conquerors who colonized the plains, implies the same relative population of the two regions as at present, ignoring variations in the food supply due to different methods of food procurement. The most densely settled Indian plains of today (except the Punjab) were cleared of heavy forest only after iron tools came into common use, with regular agriculture as the basic method of food production. A glance at the stone-age population of New Guinea shows that our hills, amenable to slash-and-burn cultivation, would have been more populated than the rest of the land when food-gathering was first supplemented by food production.

Survival of primitive ritual is to be seen not only in the quite rare practice of *satī* (a kṣatriya rite) attested from the time of Alexander, (also *F.* 20, A.D. 510; and Harṣa's mother) and Nāga worship but in the many local gods assimilated to the cult of some major Hindu god such as Viṣṇu or Śiva, or just worshipped as a cacodaemon (*vetāla*) by both brahmin and non-brahmin. One of the later land grants is of exceptional interest in this connection, as the beneficiary may, for once, not have been a brahmin, no name or *gotra* being mentioned. The Rājapura copper-plate grant of king Madhurāntakadeva, dated Oct. 5, 1065 A.D. (*EI*, IX, pp. 174-181) seems at first sight to follow the usual pattern, in somewhat worse Sanskrit than the average charter, but with the normal imprecations of brahmin-killing sin etc. against those who might wish to rescind the grant of 70 *gaḍyāṇakas* of gold, and of a village. The nameless priest is described as a *meḍipota* and *churika-meḍipota*, the chief of twelve such *pātras* (fit persons). The conclusion is (p. 177) that he performed human sacrifices, being the ancestor of those known, as late as 1884, as the twelve Melliahs in the same locality (Bastār State), whose land grants obliged them to furnish a human victim from their own families in default of any kidnapped for the ritual; the 1901 Madras *Census* reported 25 Meriahs, "reserved for human sacrifice." The king describes himself as of the Nāga lineage, making the gift "for the good of all creatures" with unanimous agreement of his queen Nāgala Mahādevī, prince Nāika, the Nāyaka Śūdraka, prince Tuṃgarāja, and the *śreṣṭhin* Puliama. This shows how the most primitive superstition had learned to simulate brahmin forms, claiming brahmin fees and class-privilege. It would prove that, for all its backwardness, brahminism was more humane and civilized than the gruesome cults it replaced in the deeper jungle (cf. also *DHI*, p. 229 footnote, Gāṅga custom of voluntary decapitation). The matter is not simple, except as a general statement; the completely brahminical *Kālikā-purāṇa* (71.18-9; 71.114-6, etc.) which belongs to the period 500-1000 A.D. according to P. K. Gode, and known practices of the Ojhas (Nesfield, pp. 63-5) show a few brahmins shedding human blood at the sacrifice, and primitive sacrificers of human beings turning into brahmins. The offering of one's own flesh, as also the sale of human flesh (*mahāmāṃsa*) appear as contemporary practices on desperate occasions, in the *Harṣacarita* (pp. 153, 199, 224).

One survival or adoption is the cult of the Mothers whose temples were built with due respect to their dreadful attendant Ḍākinīs (*F.* 17; *Rāj.* 1.122, 1.133-5, 5.55). The construction of such a temple with that of Skanda (*F.* 10) might pass, but with that of Viṣṇu (*F.* 17) is striking, inasmuch as Vaiṣṇavism has no place for the Mothers. The *Harṣacarita* locates Bhairavācārya's forest refuge near one such temple (p. 102), and men-

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

tions the custom of throwing the *piṇḍa* oblation for the Mothers into the darkness (p. 223). At the same time, donations are still being made to the *vihāras* (e.g. Vainyagupta's Gunaighar grant of 506 A.D. *IHQ*, VI (1930), 45-60) but the *vihāra* monks no longer pioneer into the wilderness, nor preach in villages, preferring to stay in the monasteries. The *Niṣāda* gotra reported by the Gaṇapāṭha on Pāṇ. 4.1.100, though not in any of the standard gotra lists, would not be possible unless some brahmins had been adopted from aboriginal priests or had served the aborigines as priests. We thus have two processes working simultaneously. First, the kings use brahminism and village settlement to make themselves independent of tribal usage and tribal economy, and to introduce caste as a regular class structure into their territory; secondly, the brahmins themselves accept all sorts of local superstition, ritual, worship, even service of guilds, becoming a cartilage group which secured the adherence to society of elements that would otherwise have been antagonistic. This adherence was thus secured by an extension of the caste system with the minimum of force, without chattel slavery or villa-manor feudalism, at the price of perpetuating primitive belief and observances to maintain the class structure.

For example: Gotamīputra Sātakaṇi, "The unique brahmin," who "lowered the pride of the kṣatriyas and stopped caste intermixture" (*EI*, VIII, pp. 59-60) nevertheless married off his son Vaṣiṭhīputra Puḷumāyi to a Śaka princess, apparently Rudradāman's daughter (*ITM*, pp. 216-218). That princess seems to be responsible for the only Sanskrit inscription of the Sātavāhanas. The Maukhari Śarvavarman boasts of his great-great-grandfather (who could only have been a tribal chief) as employing his sovereignty to impose caste-rules: *varṇāśrama-vyavasthāpana-pravṛtta-cakras* (*F.* 47); much the same phrase is used to describe his own father by Harṣavardhana who was a Buddhist, but no less an Indian king! Saṃkṣobha (*F.* 25, A.D. 528-9) proclaimed himself *varṇāśrama-dharma-sthāpana-nirata*, while his father Hastin (*F.* 21) was *atyanta-deva-brāhmaṇa-bhakta*; in view of the peculiar origin of this *parivrājaka* royal family, the love for brahmins cannot be gratuitous. Caste here means class, tending to rigid endogamy.

Caste rules were fluid in practice till settlements no longer spread but began to ingrow. *Fleet* 16 mentions a temple of the Sun founded by two *kṣatriya* merchants Acalavarman and Bhrukuṇṭha-siṃha. The brahmins themselves very rarely performed vedic animal sacrifices, for their charters name (*F.* 38-9) the five great sacrifices (against the quite explicit *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa* tradition) as *bali, caru, vaiśvadeva, agnihotra* and *atithi*, now become quite simple and non-killing. The *Manu-smṛti* (3.164) forbids the invitation to a feast for the Manes, of any brahmin who served śūdras or tribal organizations: *gaṇānām caiva yājakaḥ*. The later Nārada[11] gives detailed rules about the division of profits for a craftsmen's guild or association, which means that the brahmin had become the arbiter in such divisions, hence presumably the guild-priest and depositary of guild law. Specifically, we find a guild of fine-cloth weavers (*F.* 18, *silk* weavers, but the translation of *paṭṭa* by 'silk' is not clear to me), immigrants from Lāṭa *viṣaya*, repairing a temple of the Sun at the city of Daśapura (Mandasor) in A.D. 473-4, which they had built a generation earlier. The priests of the temple would certainly be brahmins, and the hired poet Vatsabhaṭṭi (taken as a local imitator of Kālidāsa) who composed the graceful Sanskrit verses of the epigraph was presumably a brahmin too. In *F.* 16, the brahmin Devaviṣṇu (A.D. 465-6) makes a donation to the oilmen's guild headed by Jīvanta (*jīvanta-pravarāya*), to be their absolute property even when they moved away, on condition that they remained united and supplied oil in perpetuity to a lamp in the Sun temple at Indor (Indrapura). Note that the weavers' guild implies commodity production on a considerable scale, that the weaver is not a simple village artisan, and that the merchants as well as the mobile oilmen's guild imply trade in commodities. The guild weavers of *F.* 18 possessed skill with weapons, and cultural attainments quite impossible for the caste weavers (like the Sāḷī and Koṣṭī of Mahārāṣṭra) of later, cataleptic village society.

There is more to this than 'mere' caste division. The Kāyastha caste continues to develop during the latter part of this age, from royal scribes who

[11] J. J. Meyer, *Ueber das Wesen d. altindischen Rechtsschriften* (Leipzig, 1927) shows that Nārada is the most altered of all our legal texts, but perhaps much older than believed (p. 106, 161 ff., etc.). However, he has paid no attention to the difference of emphasis.

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

themselves stem from many diverse castes, having charge of the records (*Naiṣadhīyacaritam*, 14.66; *EI*, XXIV, p. 109 ff.; *IA*, LXI, p. 49). That is, a caste forms here out of a profession, not a tribe nor even a guild. The reason for this caste stratification is the new productive basis, which had led to relations of production between groups, higher than in the tribal stage but with still primitive tools. Thus we have a tenet of brahminism for state policy (*Ms.* 8.41) that each caste and subcaste (*jāti*), tribal district (*janapada*), guild, and even large family group had to be judged by its own particular laws, obviously because it was then a unit of production. Therefore THE STATE COULD NOT UNIFORMIZE THE JURIDICAL STRUCTURE WITHIN GROUPS, BUT ONLY REGULATE TRANSACTIONS BETWEEN GROUPS. The *Arthaśāstra* regulated and taxed everything, allowing this latitude only for inheritance (*Arth.* 3.7, end), because the state was then itself the greatest entrepreneur, tolerating no dangerous competition. As the basic production becomes more and more local, i.e. commodity production per capita goes down with increasing density of village settlement, the functions of a central government would become less and less essential, dwindling to tax-collection and matters like irrigation, beyond the scope of a single village. The break-up of the Gupta and succeeding empires is due to the increase of village units—almost paradoxically to the increase of prosperity—which led to feudalism from above. That is, the new chiefs of recognized tribes, local administrators, and an occasional petty invader use the increasing village produce to turn themselves into independent raider-kings. Defeat in battle means at most that the loser or a substitute continues to rule over his original domains as subordinate to the conqueror. But his ambition, or that of his successor, and of newer princelings remains unaffected while the functions of the central government are progressively impaired. This state of affairs is replaced still later by feudalism from below, by which I mean THE STAGE WHERE LAND IS HELD BY ARMED, LOCAL, FEUDAL, TAX-COLLECTING AGENTS, USUALLY OVER A VILLAGE (BUT OFTEN SIMULTANEOUSLY LAND-OWNERS WITHIN ONE OR MORE VILLAGES), RESPONSIBLE ONLY TO A HIGHER FEUDAL LORD, NOT TO THE VILLAGE ASSEMBLY OVER WHICH THEY NOW WIELDED JUDICIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POWERS. This takes place in general during the Mohammedan period (even outside territory held by the Muslims), except in Kaśmīr where the village settlements could not be dense nor their headmen disarmed, and which consequently developed it well before the Muslim conquest, during the struggles between king and local Ḍāmara chieftains. Of course, as Marx noted, the complete break comes only with age of machine production, following British conquest. The new means (and classes) of production are demolishing caste rules, particularly in the industrial cities as was brilliantly foretold by Marx a century ago.

This content downloaded from 134.121.47.100 on Sun, 18 Oct 2015 10:51:55 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions